

The Commissioning Process: ***In Search of a Universal Definition and Application***



Agenda

■ Overview

- The Current Reality
- Defining Commissioning
- The Commissioning Process

■ Case Study

- Pfizer B220



Why More Focus on Commissioning?



- Challenges created by “speed to market” push
- Focus on maximum building operational efficiency
 - Documented lower life cycle costs/higher operating efficiency through proper Cx
 - 8-10% reduction in Operation Cost
- Owners feel that the construction costs are increasing disproportionately with building performance
- Heightened focus on occupant satisfaction
- Today's building systems/new technologies are more complex & interdependent

The Current Reality



- A study of 60 newly constructed buildings revealed that:
 - 50% suffered from control problems
 - 40% had HVAC equipment problems
 - 15% had missing equipment
 - 25% had energy management systems, economizers and/or variable speed drives that did not function properly
 - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1996

The Current Reality



- Definitions and Expectations vary
 - Commissioning vs. validation
 - What systems should be included?
- Can become a “stepchild” of the design & construction process
 - Funding allocated – spent on other “priorities”
- Even R&D and process facilities do not always take an “Integrated System Cx” approach

The Current Reality

- Linear process with little collaboration



Owner develops requirements



A/E develops technical specifications



Builder implements series of tests at the end of the project



FM/O&M staff trained afterwards and given manuals

Defining Commissioning

ASHRAE: a quality-oriented process for achieving, verifying, and documenting that the performance of facility systems and assemblies meet defined objectives and criteria.

USDOE: a systematic process of ensuring that all building systems perform interactively according to the design intent and the owner's operational needs.

COMMISSIONING
DEFINITIONS

NIBS: the systematic process of ensuring that performance of the facility and its systems meet the functional and operational needs of the owner and occupants.

ISPE: well planned, documented, & managed eng'ing approach to start-up & turnover of facilities, systems, & equip. to End-User that results in a safe & functional env. that meets estab'd design req's & stakeholder expectations.

Defining Commissioning

- Our consensus:
 - *A well-planned, documented and managed approach to the installation, start-up, turnover and verification of facilities, systems and equipment to the end-user which results in a safe, productive environment that meets the designers intent and the owner's quality expectations.*



Commissioning Objectives



- Document Owner's goals & requirements
- Establish "common success criteria"
- Keep project team focused on owner's goals & success criteria
- Verify and document that building systems meet owner's intent & need
- Train facilities personnel to properly operate & maintain the systems
- Increase operational efficiency

Design Phase



- Work with Team to determine requirements/Document design intent (BOD)
- Review Design Documents (SD, DD, CD)
- Develop Commissioning Plan and Schedule with the Team
- Develop written protocols
- Develop Technical Specifications for incorporation into “buy-out” documents

Construction & Turnover Phase



- Develop commissioning sequences
- Review submittals
- Schedule, coordinate and document system testing (TAB, etc.)
- Perform additional functional performance testing
- Provide O&M training
- Coordinate turn-over activities

During Operation



- Perform any required seasonal testing & training
- Review equipment and system performance prior to warranty period expiration
- Conduct a “Lessons Learned” session
- Provide trouble shooting support

The Commissioning Team

- Owner Representatives
- Design Professionals
- Construction Manager
- Commissioning Authority/Agent
- Suppliers / Equipment Manufacturers
- O&M Representatives
- Trade Contractors



Responsibilities

Legend: D = Develop R = Review A = Approve E = Execute	Commissioning Agent
Design CPA	-
RFP for Commissioning Agent Services	-
Design Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schematic Documents Design Documents Construction Documents 	R
Develop Commissioning Schedule	D
Develop Estimate For Full Commissioning Plan Including Implementation Costs	D
Pre-construction Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimating Scheduling Buy Out 	R
Definitive CPA	R
Develop Project Specific Commissioning Plan	D & E
Pre-Delivery Inspection (PDI) Plan	D & E
Pre-Delivery Inspection (PDI) Report	D & E
Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) Plan	D & E
Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) Report	D & E
Construction	R
Implement Commissioning Plan (perform tests)	E
Steady State ("Burn In")	R
Deliverables <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioning Report As-Built Drawings O & M / Turn Over Documents Warranties Manuals 	D & E
Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities Management/Users 	D & E
Final Commissioning Summary Report	D & E
Post-Acceptance Commissioning	-

Legend: D = Develop R = Review A = Approve E = Execute	Owner/Project Manager	Facility Manager	Architect/Engineer	Owner Stakeholders (Users, EHS, etc.)	Construction Manager (Builder)
Design CPA	D	R	R	R	-
RFP for Commissioning Agent Services	D & E	D	R	D	R
Design Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schematic Documents Design Documents Construction Documents 	A	R	D	R	R
Develop Commissioning Schedule	D	D	D	D	D
Develop Estimate For Full Commissioning Plan Including Implementation Costs	A	D	R	R	R
Pre-construction Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimating Scheduling Buy Out 	A	R	R	R	D & E
Definitive CPA	D & E	R	R	R	R
Develop Project Specific Commissioning Plan	D & A	D	R	D	R
Pre-Delivery Inspection (PDI) Plan	A	A	R	R	R
Pre-Delivery Inspection (PDI) Report	A	A	R	R	R
Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) Plan	A	A	R	R	R
Factory Acceptance Test (FAT) Report	A	A	R	R	R
Construction	R & A	R & A	R	R	E
Implement Commissioning Plan (perform tests)	R	A	R	E	E
Steady State ("Burn In")	R	A & E	R	A & E	R
Deliverables <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioning Report As-Built Drawings O & M / Turn Over Documents Warranties Manuals 	R & A	R & A	D & E	R	D & E
Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities Management/Users 	A	A & E	R	R	D & E
Final Commissioning Summary Report	A	A	R	R	R
Post-Acceptance Commissioning	R	D & E	-	D & E	-

Case Study – Pfizer B220



- 600,000 SF
- 800-plus Occupants
- \$50 Million-plus M/E/P Systems
- 7,000-plus Fan / Pump Horsepower
- 65 VFDs
- 450 Lab Hoods



Lab Compressed Air



- Field testing revealed a susceptibility to loss of cooling water
- System was modified to ease maintenance and reduce downtime during maintenance

Lab Vacuum Systems



- Field testing revealed a problem with exhaust backpressure that caused safety trip shutdowns at higher loads
- System has modified to meet design criteria
- Users wanted a deeper, higher volume vacuum that the system could not provide even though design criteria was clear

Chilled Water



- 6600 tons – 14,000 GPM @ 42F
- System automatically diverts to “free cooling” mode at 47F outside air and isolates from the campus supply
- Testing revealed need for rapid transition to maintain space temperatures; campus system required a slow transition so as not to impact chillers
- Sequence of operation was modified to protect the campus system with minimal impact to control

Steam Systems



- 140,000 #/HR – Five PRVs
- Testing saw excessive AHU tripping on low temperature detectors in the 1st heating season
- Control strategies had to be modified to allow for a compromise between time to control at startup & tight control in steady state operation
- Research also indicated the need for additional drip traps, which helped solve the problem
- Problem was solved in the 1st season rather than lingering
- Information provided to designers re existing steam supply did not prove out

Manifolded Air Handlers



- 3 Units - >150,000 CFM delivered
- Pressure relief doors caused problems with pressure controls and related safeties
- Testing revealed a need to modify control strategies to suit both a rapid startup (e.g. restarting 1 unit after PM) and steady state control

Vivarium Controls



- Each room (>100)– individual T/RH/dP
- User introduced a 30 day “burn-in” requirement that was not part of the original Commissioning program and not in the schedule
- Combined accuracies of related controls (AHU through local) meant a practical limit on humidity available for many rooms that was not anticipated

Manifolded Lab Exhaust Systems



- 7 fans / > 400,000 CFM
- Field testing indicated problems with the automatic restart (one or more fans) sequence
- Sequence was revised to improve reliability and revise the automatic backup (running backup is now “rested”)

Lessons Learned



- Phased occupancy of a Commissioned building means retesting and disruption to occupants of the earlier phases
- Accurate information on the existing utilities to serve the building is critical to successful operation
- Lab hood flow measurement needs to account for accuracies of available controls & test equipment
- Users must clearly understand the design criteria – so that there are no surprises at occupancy & systems do what they need to do